

THE
MONTHLY MISCELLANY.

VOL. I.

JULY, 1839.

NO. 4.

MANAGEMENT OF CONSCIENCE.

Our remarks in this article need not be prefaced by a formal definition of conscience. They are designed to be practical, and though they may occasionally discover themselves to be founded on a particular theory of the moral constitution of man, will be essentially applicable to any of the various theories which have been maintained on the subject.

We would first speak of the importance of listening implicitly to our own unbiased sense of right, and, ultimately, to that alone. The direction to all true goodness comes from within. Hints and suggestions of duty may indeed come from various outward sources, but it is only when they have been considered and ratified by conscience, that they become binding. Upon every question of duty a man should "be fully persuaded in his own mind." His inquiries should be as extensive as he can make them; he should use all the means within his reach that can help him to a correct decision; he should resort to all the sources from which light may be

obtained ; he should take heed to the counsels of pious friends, to the censures of enemies, to the example of the wise and good ; but, at the same time, he should remember that by none of these is conscience to be finally determined ; they only furnish it with the materials on which it is to make up its decision. We cannot too sacredly guard this sacred principle of our nature, the moral judgment, against all extraneous influences. As the mariner carefully removes from the magnetic needle every disturbing cause which might prevent it from freely obeying its natural tendency, and thus render it useless or the means of leading him to destruction, so should we protect conscience, our guide on a voyage in which momentous interests are at stake, from the perverting influences of passion and appetite, of circumstances, accident and public opinion.

It is a truth which cannot be too distinctly and strongly urged, that obedience to this monitor is the way to do right ; that conformity to its dictates is the appointed means of growth in goodness, the process by which the spiritual nature is to be developed, a holy character matured, and the greatest glory and highest good of our nature attained. When we speak of the decisions of conscience, we are to be understood, be it remembered, to speak of the conclusions to which a man has come, who is truly desirous of knowing his duty, and who has faithfully used all the means and light within his reach. With this explanation, we say, it is a truth which no honest mind can pervert, that whatever a man's conscience, thus consulted, pronounces to be right, is the right to him ;—it is his duty ;—he is under obligation to do it. Of this any one may be assured, by considering the question, if this is *not* the right to him, what is ? if his duty cannot be finally ascertained in this manner, how can it be ? And so too whatever conscience, thus consulted, determines to be wrong, is sin to him ; and if, influenced by fear or shame, or public sentiment or example, or actuated by a spirit of revolt against conscience as imposing a restriction on the liberty which he sees others enjoying, or induced by any other consideration, inward or

outward, not affecting the moral character of the act under consideration, he presumes to violate that perception of duty, he sins against God, and grievously wrongs his own soul.

Here an objection may be started. Cases of over scrupulous, morbid conscience are not infrequent. There are persons to whose religion an austere and gloomy character is imparted, by natural temperament, education, or peculiarities of belief. They assume that self mortification is meritorious for its own sake, and are jealous of every thing which gives pleasure to the senses or a cheerful flow to the spirits. They avoid as sin gratifications and amusements which others, to all candid judgment, as good as they, partake of without scruple. And as the position which they endeavour to maintain is unnatural and untenable, they are made continually unhappy by their failures of supposed duty. Much spiritual energy is thus wasted, much innocent happiness lost, and much injury is done to religion, which is presented to the eyes of the world in a stern and forbidding aspect. Now, it may be asked, are not such cases clear exceptions to the principle which has been laid down? Would it not be better for a man to break through those needless restraints, and assume at once a more liberal course of conduct? If he goes on, scrupulously shunning every thing which his conscience in this state forbids, is there not danger that he will sink at last into a most narrow and abject superstition? Is not this state of mind produced and nurtured by the rule of implicit obedience which has been inculcated? To these questions we would decidedly answer, No. If a man in the state described has no doubt whatever that the restrictions and privations to which he subjects himself are absolutely required by duty, what, we ask, can he do, but submit to them? However we may deplore the unnecessary wretchedness which he inflicts upon himself, how can we imagine that his spiritual well being would be promoted by living in constant violation of his own clear sense of right? Whatever we may think of the innocence of the indulgences which he conscientiously denies himself, how could we hold him guiltless if he allowed

himself in them? If, by any cause, he has been led to doubt the correctness of his past course, that is a reason—not, indeed, for immediately changing it, but for a farther examination of the subject, and that examination may produce a conviction that he is permitted to change his course, and then, and then only, can he do so with innocence. But if, whilst his conviction is strong and undoubting that the course he has hitherto pursued is the way of duty, he is led, by impatience at its restrictions, and by desire of the same liberty which he sees his neighbour using, deliberately to forsake it and turn into a more agreeable one, words cannot express the folly of his conduct. Such a violent mode of proceeding is not the way to cure a morbid conscience. It can only serve to inflame it, and aggravate its diseased action; and if at length it does produce a cessation of pain, it can only be, by causing a callous insensibility. This state of conscience bears the same relation to its sound and natural state, that the acute sensibility of a wound or ulcer bears to a whole and healthy skin. Who would attempt to correct that sensibility by bringing it forcibly into contact with substances from which it shrinks with pain? Should not such substances, on the contrary, be carefully kept from it, until by mild and gentle treatment the diseased part has been brought into a state to bear them? In a similar manner should an over scrupulous conscience be treated. The only hope of its restoration to a sound state, and of the redemption of its subject from needless restraints and superstitious fears, is in a faithful compliance with its clear behests, together with a meek and humble looking unto God for more light. Reflection, Obedience, Prayer;—these are the three means of enlightening conscience; and of these obedience yields to neither of the others in importance. There is no surer method of gaining juster and wider views of duty than by carefully performing what has already been revealed to us. Many a darkened and fettered soul has thus worked its way to light and freedom. Many who began their christian course with distressing scruples and anxieties, have thus passed through them into the

glorious liberty of the children of God. But, if their deliverance had not come in this world, better was it for them to walk through life in the heaviest chains which a mistaken conscience ever bound upon a soul, and to wait till the light of another world beamed upon their minds, than to cast off those chains unbidden, or attempt to walk by a light of their kindling.

Again it may be objected that conscience has been made the excuse of gross and palpable sin. Its sanction has been claimed by individuals and bodies of men for acts which the general conscience of mankind distinctly condemn as crimes. Holy wars, religious persecutions and fanatical assassinations will readily occur to the recollection of our readers. It may be asked, do not cases like these show that conscience is an uncertain guide, and that the rule of implicit obedience to it may sometimes lead to serious error. We answer, that they show what was to have been expected, that conscience, like every other faculty of our nature, is liable to perversion. Some of these cases may be imputed to absolute insanity, and therefore laid out of the account in a question relating to the conduct of rational and accountable beings. Others may be accounted for by extreme ignorance. And in many cases, doubtless, the plea of conscience has been falsely set up. Men either deceive themselves, ascribing to their own passions the authority of conscience, or they deliberately make the pretence, for the purpose of deceiving others. To one or the other of these classes, we believe, all cases will be found to belong in which flagrant crimes, acts which are pronounced to be such by the universal conscience of mankind, are committed under the plea of conscience. But after all these allowances are made, it is still an undeniable fact that there are many very doubtful questions of duty, and that with the best intentions and the utmost care a man will sometimes pursue a course which proves productive of evil. In all cases in which there is a possibility of going wrong, what course shall a man adopt? Shall he abstain from action altogether? Shall he follow any other guide than conscience? Most obviously, neither. His only course is, to form the best judgment he can

respecting his duty and to follow it confidently. Then if any evil consequences ensue, he may feel regret, indeed, but not remorse ; he is not accountable for these consequences. He may gather wisdom from his failures to qualify him to form a more enlightened judgment another time. It is a part of the discipline of life that we should learn the way of right and duty by experience.

We proceed to two practical applications of our principle. It applies to the choice of amusements and pleasures. This is a subject upon which many, doubtless, find much difficulty and feel the necessity of direction. There are some pleasures and amusements which are manifestly impure ; respecting which no conscientious man can question that they are forbidden. But there are many more which are not palpably corrupt in their nature or tendency, but of doubtful character, concerning which a person sincerely desirous of doing right, may be much perplexed by the question, of which shall I partake, and to what extent ? To these inquiries the only adequate answer that can be given is the general one, you must be ultimately directed by your own experience and conviction. Let us suppose the case of a person to whom his spiritual improvement is a serious concern, meeting an opportunity of participating in some recreation. It is, we will suppose, a reputable, customary, and, to all appearance, innocent recreation. He sees no moral reason why he should not indulge in it, and accordingly he does so. He does so, perhaps, again and again. By and by he begins to perceive, that it absorbs more time, or involves a greater expense, than he can afford ; or, what is more to our present purpose, he finds by experience that it interferes with his religious progress. The anticipation of it, and thinking of it afterward distract his mind and prevent him from devoting its undivided energies to useful and important occupation. It robs him of the quiet possession of his own soul ; unfits him for prayer ; and instead of sending him back to the serious duties of life, with renewed relish and vigor, which is the true test of necessary and innocent recreation, gives him a disgust for

them. Now, we say, that experience is decisive. He cannot, henceforth, allow himself that recreation, without violating conscience and giving up the wish of spiritual improvement. Let him not say, why should I be more scrupulous than others? Why should I refrain from indulgences in which every one around me is freely partaking? Why should I fear to allow myself what better men than myself, seem to think perfectly innocent? It may be, that the neighbour whose practice is thus used as a plea, is not so careful as he should be of his own soul; it may be that in this very matter he is acting against the secret admonition of his own conscience; or, it may be that in consequence of difference of temperament, or superior strength of mind, he can bear more excitement and diversion. At any rate, a consideration of his conduct is nothing at all to the purpose. Each one is to give account of himself unto God, and his neighbour cannot do it for him. Each one will be judged, not by another's convictions but by his own.

It has been given as a rule respecting pleasures and recreations, to engage in none on which we could not ask the blessing of God and for which we could not render him thanks. It appears to us to be as sound as it is simple and comprehensive. We can imagine no objection which a reflecting mind can make to it. If it appears to any one too strict, it must, we think, be owing to one or the other of two mistakes. Either the mind which so regards it has become so perverted as to attach the idea of enjoyment only to the guilty or pernicious gratifications which are falsely called pleasures, or some strangely erroneous notion must be entertained of the character of God, as if it could ever be inconsistent with his all-benevolent will, that his children should be innocently happy. We believe that the rule mentioned comprehends all true enjoyments. We believe that within the limits it prescribes, lie a boundless number and a rich variety of refreshing and delightful pleasures;—pleasures of sense and bodily exercise, of imagination, taste, humour and social intercourse;—pleasures which conscience approves, and on

which God smiles, for he, in his infinite love, provided them, and meant that we should enjoy them ; and we would that his blessing might ever be invoked upon them, and " his praise due paid," for it would add a new and high satisfaction to the enjoyment.

Having spoken at large of the application of our principle to pleasures, we need say less of its application to business. It is obvious that the spirit of the remarks which have been made is equally applicable to this extensive and important subject, which gives rise to many difficult and delicate questions of duty. It applies to the kind of business in which a man engages ;—to particular practices in the transaction of a business in itself lawful and proper ;—and to the degree in which he devotes himself to an occupation which in its own character is wholly unexceptionable. We would briefly illustrate these three applications. A man may become convinced that the occupation he has been pursuing is wrong ; not in some of its incidental effects merely, but in its whole tendency, in the very end and object which it proposes. When he has become so convinced, however reputable that occupation may still be, though public feeling may be dead to its sinfulness, he cannot longer continue in it with innocence. Again, a man may feel quite sure that the business in which he is engaged is right ; it supplies some want, or promotes some beneficial end in society ; it contributes to the general good and can be carried on without injury to a single individual. But, perhaps, there have crept into the transaction of that business, and have become customary, so as no longer to be generally regarded as wrong, practices which he perceives to be wrong, which are inconsistent with the high and nice sense of rectitude which he has attained ;—here is another case to which our principle applies. From the moment he begins to doubt the correctness of those practices, and for a still stronger reason, from the moment he is persuaded they are wrong, to him they are sin. Again, though an occupation be perfectly innocent both in its object and in all its details, still, as the most wholesome and

necessary article of food may become the means of death when taken to excess, so may too great devotion to such occupations be fatal to the welfare of the soul. There is a point beyond which the cares and engagements of business greatly hinder religious improvement. They may occupy his whole time, and leave no leisure for reflection and self-examination. They may engross the thoughts and affections and leave no inclination for these spiritual employments. A man may go on thus, till his soul becomes wholly secularized, and loses its interest in its own highest concerns, till his spiritual nature seems to be extinguished, and he becomes a mere creature of this world. A man who is truly solicitous about his spiritual condition, will be on the watch to observe the point where this danger commences, and he will be willing to moderate his desires, contract the sphere of his operations, and give up a portion of his expected acquisitions, rather than incur the fearful risk; for what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? This is a subject which belongs exclusively to a man's own heart. The world does not pretend to take cognizance of it. A friend cannot effectually advise upon it. It is a case in which one is very liable to deceive himself. There is no case in the decision of which there is more need of deep and impartial self-inspection, of jealousy of all wrong biases, of earnest prayer for direction.

We must conclude with a few words of caution. Our remarks in this article are designed only for those whose consciences are alive and sensitive; who are interested about their duty and desire and intend to perform it. The thoughtless and indifferent, they who can act without doubt or scruple because they do not reflect upon the character of their actions, and because conscience does not pronounce upon them at all;—they who can immerse themselves to any extent they please in business or in pleasure, without being sensible of suffering harm from them, because their spiritual nature is not awakened, and the condition of their souls is not a subject of solicitude to them;—these are not the persons whom we have addressed. Let not such pervert our remarks into a sedative to conscience or an encouragement to sin.

DIALOGUE FROM REAL LIFE.

SWEDENBORGIAN—CALVINIST—UNITARIAN—QUAKER.

Swedenborgian. I infer, Mr. O., from a remark you just made, that you have been reading Taylor's Physical Theory of Another Life. How do you like the book?*

Unitarian. Quite well upon the whole. The author displays much science and considerable imagination. One rises from the perusal of the work, with grander ideas of the Universe, and with a nearer sense of the things of the eternal world. Part of his theory seems to me Swedenborgian, yet I am much pleased with his speculations. I presume the author himself does not wish his meditations to be taken as positive truth.

S. I infer then, that you are not sectarian, and are willing to like the productions of minds out of the pale of your own sect.

U. I call myself a pretty good Unitarian, yet am happy to find goodness and light wherever they may be found. The most enlarged minds, however, are not as free, as they think from sectarian bias.

S. Have you ever met with Swedenborg's "Heaven and Hell?"

U. Yes. A young friend, whose acquaintance I much prized, at Cincinnati, lent it to me. I was much interested in the book. The theory of a future state, there given, is in many points very beautiful, especially the doctrine of correspondences between the other and the present life—the glorification of the material world, by which every object of earthly interest will exist for us in the spiritual world, only in

a transfigured or glorified form, and in Heaven the fields shall have a celestial verdure, and sun and moon shall shine with purer light, and more genial warmth. This is very good poetry.

There is much in Swedenborg that I like, and am very willing to look upon his system, as a very remarkable attempt to found a complete scientific system upon the basis of the common Christian Theology. But his dogmatism particularly troubles me. For instance, I don't know what to make of that part of his Heaven and Hell, in which he undertakes to say, into what part of hell Unitarians will be cast. And if I mistake not he dooms Trinitarians also to a place in hell. His doctrine of the Godhead is more rational than the Trinitarian, I am inclined to think.

S. Yes. He believes neither in three Gods, like the Trinitarian, nor does he deny the Godhead of Christ. He believes in one God, the Father, and in Jesus, as the manifestation of the Father in the flesh.

U. That is to me the most rational form of the doctrine of the Godhead of Christ. I am willing to adopt it, if you will allow me to say that the Father was *with* the Son, and *in* him. I cannot believe that the Son *was* the Father, or in any sense was God himself.

Swedenborgian and Calvinist. What! reject the Divinity of Christ?

U. No. I do not reject the belief in Christ's Divinity, or in his being filled with the Divine Presence, as none other in human form ever was. Yet I see not the slightest proof in Scripture or reason, that Jesus Christ was God himself.

C. Why sir, does not Christ say, "I and my Father are one?"

U. Yes, and in that very connection, he goes on to explain what he means by such unity, and prays, that his disciples may be one with each other and himself, even as he is one with the Father—that is, one in spirit. In the same connection also, and through the record of the same Apostle, he declares his inferiority to the Father, "My Father is greater than I."

C. But he did not contradict the Jews, when they accused him of making himself equal with God.

U. He did contradict them virtually. He said if the men of old unto whom the word of the law came were called Gods, it was not blasphemy, that he whom the Father had sanctified and sent should call himself the Son of God. Moreover, by looking at the passage you will find that the point of accusation among the Jews, which Christ answered, was not that he called himself directly God, but the Son of God. Look at John x, for yourself.

C. But did not Thomas call Jesus "My Lord and my God?"

U. No. He merely exclaimed, My Lord and My God, when the reality of Christ's resurrection was proved to him. What more natural for him, than to speak the name of God, as in ejaculatory prayer, in view of so wondrous a display of Divine Power, in raising the Son from the grave.

C. You will at least allow, that Jesus said to his disciples, He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father also?

U. Of course I allow it, but I should doubt your inference from that passage of Scripture. I believe Christ to have been the moral image and representative of God. He, therefore, who saw the Son, in a spiritual sense, saw the Father. Put what interpretation you please upon this passage, it will not favour your view. If they, who looked on Christ, saw the Father in person, then Christ was not the second person in the Trinity, but was the Father himself,—a doctrine which our Swedenborgian friend here asserts, and which you deny.

C. But without urging this point further, let me ask you, if Christ is not called the Alpha and Omega?

U. Yes. But the passage in the Book of Revelation, which declares this, by no means declares him to be God. Christ was indeed the beginning and end, the Alpha and Omega of the new dispensation, the Christian Religion.

C. You seem to have some ingenuity in explaining the Scriptures your own way, but you cannot explain away the declaration in Hebrews 1, 2, that Christ made the world.

U. No such thing is stated in the book of Hebrews. It is said there, that God made the world *through* his Son. God works by inferior agents, and the very fact of God using the Son as an instrument of creation shows the Son's inferiority. Moreover, the word translated, 'worlds' means rather 'ages,' and we of course allow that God ordained the new *ages*, or Christian dispensation, through Christ. None of your alleged texts do anything to shake the doctrine of Christ, "My Father is greater than I."

C. But my dear sir, be careful how you talk. Did not Christ exercise Supreme power, raise the dead, and control the elements?

U. Yes. But the power was given him. Does he not say, The Father, that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works?

C. He surely knew all things, and therefore was the Omniscient God.

U. He denies knowing all things, and says he did not know the time of the judgment.

C. Ah, but it was only in his human nature, that he was ignorant of this event. In his Divine nature he knew all things.

U. Of course in so far as he was God, he was Omniscient, but since he expressly tells us, that he was ignorant of an important future event, we must conclude of course that he was not wholly God.

S. The whole of this difficulty is obviated by remembering the distinction between the revealed and the unrevealed God. The Father was the unrevealed God, who manifested himself in the Son. The Father unrevealed knew all things. But the Son did not know all things.

U. As far as I comprehend your obscure language, you but repeat my doctrine. Of course the Father knows all things, and the Son knows as much as the Father revealed to him. But it appears by the Scriptures, that he did not reveal to the Son the day of judgment. The Son was not Omniscient, therefore, and was not God.

S. But Christ was full of Wisdom and Love—filled with all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

U. True, but that does not make him God. We are all called on to aspire to a fulness of Divine Grace, yet it is not expected we shall become God himself.

C. But you must remember, that without the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, there can be no infinite atonement. The infinite sin of mankind requires an infinite sacrifice—the sacrifice of Deity himself.

S. and U. That doctrine is an absurdity.

U. Yes. You now see I have an advocate in my brother, who has just been on your side. He rejects, as I do, the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice—or the sacrifice of the second person in the Godhead, or any sinless being, as an equivalent or substitute for the sins of mankind.

C. But don't you feel the need of an atonement? Are not all sinners?

U. Yes, all are sinners, and the great motive to reconciliation or atonement, or union with God, is found in the mission of his Son, especially in the love of Christ, as shown on the Cross, and the power of God in raising him from the grave. I see in all this no sacrifice of Christ to God's wrath, but an offering of the sinless Jesus for the benefit of sinful men. He sealed his truth by his blood, and the eternal life was confirmed by his resurrection. His death is thus the great fact that should touch the heart with sense of its sin, and kindle the hope of eternal life.

C. But the whole Old Testament is full of the doctrine of sacrifice.

S. Yes. But we choose to judge of the great sacrifice upon New Testament principles, and not by the narrow ideas of the Jews. It is the motive that hallows a deed in the sight of God. Even in regard to sacrifices under the old dispensation, it was the motive that rendered them acceptable. Of course, then, the sacrifice of Christ is important only as it showed his Divine Love. It was not the mere drops of blood, but the Love, that poured out its blood in attestation of the

truth. It was by this, that humanity was glorified in the dying Saviour, and the union of man and God, or the Atonement, was made complete.

U. Let us end here, for we can all agree that the great aim of Christ's death was to touch the human heart, and lead to a union of human hearts with God.

C. Do your preachers tell men of their sins and insist on the necessity of repentance and faith in Christ?

U. We assuredly do. I defy you to point out more strict preachers in insisting on the necessity of repentance of sin and a living faith in Christ, than are to be found in our pulpits.

C. I had mistaken you then altogether. This conversation has given me some new ideas. And although my creed is unshaken, I trust I have taken some useful lessons in charity.

Quaker. Friends, I have listened to your conversation, and while you differ so much in doctrine, have been pleased to find so much kindness of spirit. Let us remember, that charity is chief of the graces.

U. Our friend seems to be orthodox indeed. Christian Love is after all the main point, and without charity all knowledge is a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbol. Let us bear this faith to our pillows, and pray our Heavenly Father to give us all needful light concerning truth and duty. It is already late and we are disturbing our fellow-passengers, who have gone to their berths and are seeking sleep.*

* This is the substance of a dialogue between a Unitarian, a Calvinistic and a Swedenborgian minister, around the stove of a steamboat cabin a few months since on the Ohio river.
 S. O.

TRUTH.

As for the Truth, it endureth, and is always strong, it liveth and conquereth for evermore. I Esdras, iv. 38.

THEORIES, which thousands cherish,
Pass like clouds that sweep the sky;
Creeds and dogmas all must perish;
Truth herself can never die.

From the glorious heavens above her,
She has shed her beams abroad,
That the souls who truly love her,
May become the sons of God.

Worldlings blindly may refuse her,
Close their eyes and call it night;
Learned scoffers may abuse her;
But they cannot quench her light!

Thrones may totter, empires crumble,
All their glories cease to be,
While she, Christ-like, crowns the humble,
And from bondage sets them free.

God himself will e'er defend her,
From the fury of her foe,
Till she in her native splendor,
Sits enthroned o'er all below.

R. C. W.

THE ART OF HEARING.

BY THE AUTHOR OF "THE RECOLLECTIONS OF JOTHAM ANDERSON."

A GREAT deal is said about the "Art of Speaking;" indeed, there has been a book published with that title. Many treatises have been made on the "Art of Preaching," and a multitude of lessons on it are continually given. But I do not know that any treatise has been written on the "Art of Hearing," or that it has been the subject of express and systematic instruction in any university or school. Yet it seems to me that it as well deserves attention. If we may judge from what we observe in society, we may say that there are as many faulty hearers as there are bad speakers; and that how to listen is as important an attainment as how to talk or preach.

In conversation, for example, it only requires a good portion of self-confidence and fluency to be a good talker; but it demands the high virtues of patience and self-denial to be a good listener. It is a fact too, that we often hear the listeners lauding in strong terms the fluent and happy talkers; but it is very rare to hear one of your great talkers compliment his audience as good listeners. Yet it is plain, meantime, that the satisfaction and pleasure of conversation depend as essentially on the quiet and respectful attention of those who do not talk, as on the copious utterance of those who do. This was pleasantly illustrated in the case of Madam de Stäel, who came home one evening delighted with the manner in which she had spent it, and especially with one gentleman to whom she had been talking in an animated strain a large portion of the time. Who is that most agreeable and delightful man? she asked;

and was told in reply, that he was a person deaf and dumb—who of course had neither heard nor spoken. So excellent a thing is the talent of listening in silence. He who has the art of talking, is happy to take the whole charge of the conversation on himself, and will think as highly of his understanding who passively listens, as the listener does of him who perpetually talks.

A treatise on the Art of Hearing, would therefore place in the first class the virtues of patient silence and acquiescent attention; great virtues, at times, because they involve great self-denial. It was no small exercise of these virtues which was exhibited when the two celebrated talkers, Mr. H. and Mr. Y. met on one occasion in a select company. Each had been accustomed, like the sun, to have the whole hemisphere to himself; each had lived for years, pouring forth the perpetual streams of his light, before which all lesser stars had hidden their diminished heads. We were curious to see what would be the consequence of their meeting in the firmament; we looked for little less than a conflagration alike sublime and terrible. We all felt nervous, and some of us fairly trembled as the time approached. And for a little season there seemed ground for apprehension. The two glories rushed upon the topics which came up, with all the eagerness and confidence that became so accustomed champions; and as their voices rose and their wit flashed and their excited periods rolled on more rapid and more loud, it seemed that each was soon to be lost in the confusion that grew out of the eloquence of both. It was clear that if both should insist on speaking, and neither be willing to hear, all profitable intercourse would soon be at an end. It is not strange that we became anxious and drew our breath hard.

But very happily, Mr. H. at least had learned the Art of Hearing; and though it was long since he had had occasion to practice it, he had not wholly lost it; some remnants of it remained by him, as the fragments of Greek lie in the memory of a country doctor for twenty-five years after leaving college; they give no signs of life, and he twenty-five times every year

says his Greek was of no manner of use to him ; but on some sudden emergency, as when his son is about to enter college, he finds to his amazement that the characters lie unobliterated in his mind, and can be called up for use. So Mr. H., perceiving soon the ridiculousness of this confused din of words, was suddenly reminded of his former maxim, that *there is a duty of listening as well as a right of talking* ; he drew in his voluble forces, and by dint of some self-restraint, spent the remainder of the time in harkening respectfully to the eloquent declamation of Mr. Y.

May we not say, that this man went down to his house justified rather than the other ? For on which side was the exercise of virtue ? On that of him who listened ; it was a great act of self-denial ; it was self-control, humility, and patience. But the other had merely gratified himself ; he had thought only of self-display and triumph ; and he went home priding himself on having out-talked and silenced his most celebrated competitor. Who can doubt then, that the Art of Hearing is a higher art than the Art of Speaking ? Even we who listened delighted to the entertaining flow of the unwearied talker, and freely gave it our admiration, yet felt a deeper respect for him who yielded the prize and surrendered the contest for the sake of the common good.

The treatise in question would place next on the list of virtues, integrity and truth. It would show how greatly we err when we attribute all falsehood to the tongue, and suppose lying to be a gift of speech alone. It would explain to us that the ear is oftentimes more to blame than the lips ; that wrong hearing is as frequent and baleful an evil as wrong speaking ; that if the tongue " is a fire, a world of iniquity," it is the ear that furnishes the combustible materials by means of which the conflagration is kindled. For instance,—trace to their origin the multitude of false reports which are flying about in the community ; how many of them begin with intentional lying on the part of the tongue ? Not one in a thousand. They begin with the error or thoughtlessness or malice of the first hearer ; the first speaker is innocent of blame. It was an

incorrect and undisciplined Ear, not a slanderous and back-biting Tongue, which did the wrong.

One needs only call to mind the miserable scandal that has been recently circulating in his own neighbourhood, to be satisfied of the truth of this remark. Here is a story going about respecting Mr. Jones or Mr. Smith, very much to his disadvantage, very contrary to his supposed character, yet believed to his injury, because—why? One would like to understand why it is, that people so readily believe an ill tale of a man even when they know it to be inconsistent with his principles and character; but for some reason they do believe it. Has he an enemy? Has some one deliberately and intentionally belied him? Not so; but as John Robbins was passing by the tavern door, he thought he heard somebody say that neighbour Smith was a very good temperance man, but that he made money enough by selling rum across the river. So he repeated the saying to his partner the next morning; and every body in the town was told before night, that this honest neighbour, who had been the first to give up a profitable trade in spirits, was yet clandestinely dealing in them in another place. It was long before he could wipe off this blot, which caused him to be suspected and distrusted; and the great injustice arose simply from the careless ears of John Robbins, which did not retain the words “his brother,” in the sentence he repeated.

Instances like this, and worse, can be called to mind by almost every man; and yet every man goes on believing every tale! An anecdote is half heard or half remembered, and then recited as if it was the whole. Or it is heard with a malicious ear, which puts a misconstruction on it, and causes it to be repeated with that misconstruction attached to it. And thus from inaccuracy, or heedlessness, or ill-will, a very innocent transaction is made to appear discreditable, and fair reputations receive an incurable wound. Eager and itching ears drink in the incredible slander, which would otherwise sink forgotten into the ground.

The sins of the Tongue are many and deadly ; but they are rivalled in number and in mischief by the sins of the Ear. It is said in Holy Writ, that " he who sins not with his tongue, the same is a perfect man." And it is well that we should repeat and confirm as we do, the keen and cutting language with which that volume rebukes the wrongs of the " unruly member." But it would be well if, at the same time, we more carefully remembered and more sacredly heeded, the repeated admonitions of Christ, " Take heed *how* ye hear;" and " Take heed *what* ye hear."

There still remains another case to be treated of.

SELECTION.

THEY that deny a God destroy a man's nobility ; for certainly man is of kin to the beasts by his body ; and, if he be not of kin to God by his spirit, he is a base and ignoble creature. It destroys likewise magnanimity, and the raising human nature ; for take an example of a dog, and mark what a generosity and courage he will put on when he finds himself maintained by a man, who to him is instead of a God, or "*melior naturâ*;" which courage is manifestly such as that creature, without that confidence of a better nature, than his own, could never attain. So man, when he resteth and assureth himself upon divine protection and favour, gathereth a force and faith, which human nature in itself could not obtain ; therefore, as atheism is in all respects hateful, so in this, that it depriveth human nature of the means to exalt itself above human frailty.—*Lord Bacon.*

THE SETTING SUN.

FROM THE GERMAN OF KOSEGARTEN.

SUN, thou sinkest !
Sun, thou sinkest !
Sink in peace, O Sun !
Still and quiet is thy departing step ;
Moving and solemn is thy departing silence ;
In sadness smileth thy friendly eye ;
Tears fall from thy golden lashes ;
Blessings pourest thou on the vapory earth.

Ever deeper,
Ever gentler,
Ever more earnest and solemn,
Sinkest thou, after the winds !

Sun, thou sinkest !
Sun, thou sinkest !
Sink in peace, O Sun !
The people bless thee,
The breezes nestle,
And smoke the steaming meadows after thee !
Winds breathe moist through thy curling hair ;
Waves cool thy burning cheeks ;
Wide opens thy watery bed.
Rest in peace !
Slumber in bliss !
The nightingale sings to thee songs of slumber !

Sun, thou sinkest !

Sun, thou sinkest !

Sink in peace, O Sun !

Sweet is it to sink thus after the sweat of the day,

Sweet into the arms of repose,

After the well-borne daily task.

Thou hast thy daily task endured,

Thou hast it gloriously completed,

Worlds hast enlightened and Worlds hast warmed ;

The bosom of earth hast made fruitful,

The swelling buds hast thou reddened,

The cups of the flowers hast thou opened,

The green seeds hast thou ripened ;

Hast nourished Worlds, and Worlds refreshed,

Hast loved and love hast gathered,

Blessed, and around with blessings,

Thy waving hair hast crowned.

Slumber soft,

After the sweat of the day ;

Waken joyful,

After youth-giving slumbers !

Waken, a young, rejoicing hero,

Waken to new exploits.

For thee waits the thirsty creation ;

For thee wait lowland and meadow ;

For thee wait birds and beasts ;

For thee waits the wanderer in darkness ;

For thee waits the seaman in storms ;

For thee waits the sick on his bed ;

For thee waits the holiest of delights,

The delight—to love and be loved ;

And bliss the most unutterable,

The high and godlike bliss of well-doing !

Sink in peace !

Slumber in quiet !

Awake in transports, O Sun !

xx.

ORIGIN OF EVIL.

Who has lived long unacquainted with pain and sorrow ? And who has not *wondered* at the spectacle of human misery, all things happening alike to all, or perhaps the wicked triumphant while the righteous is afflicted—the poor orphan perishing with cold and hunger, while the cheerful fire burns in many a palace of iniquity ; and luxury loads the rich-carved table. Whose spirit has not been oppressed with this mystery of evil,—of its existence and its distribution ? But has it no explanation ? The explanation has been attempted. And first, atheism points to the facts with scorn, and says, In these things you find proof of a benevolent God ! Conclude rather there *is no* such Being. All these mingled pains and joys come from a blind, resistless Destiny, doing all things, and knowing nothing that it does. The wheel of a changeless Fate rolls darkly through the Universe, grinding into powder the habitations of men, and crushing all things fair and lovely. A Benevolent God ! There is no God but an eternal, unfeeling, unknowing, irresistible necessity. Such is the explanation that atheism gives of human sorrow.

But the world is amazed at such language. The good man is shocked,—even the savage of the forest turns back in horror and clings with new affection to his simple belief—the groaning sufferer himself rejects such consolation, and feels something moving at his heart that points him to a nobler belief.

Again :—a narrow Philosophy gives *its* explanation of mortal ill. As it sees happiness and misery forever struggling together, it can solve the difficulty only by supposing both a good and a malevolent Deity. It is not like atheism, stone-

blind,—and, therefore, beholds in the Universe overwhelming proof of an intelligent purpose. It cannot fail to recognize the evidence also of ever-flowing goodness. But in the floods of misery, which, in their turn, deluge the world, it beholds, it thinks, manifestations of unkindness. And therefore, by the side of the benevolent Father it places an equal, malevolent Deity ; and in the perpetual wars of Heaven finds a source for the continual miseries of earth.

But though such a philosophy has been professed by a few, the human mind rejects the speculation. Its instinctive Faith recognizes no such equal opposition between good and evil. The undisturbed beauty of creation refutes it. The laws of nature keep up no strife. The orbs of Heaven do not rush into conflict. The ocean does not roll suddenly over the land, but is barred by the fine sands of the shore. The sun does not rise in darkness, and set in blood ; but the soft promise of the dawn heralds its coming, and the clouds are piled grandly about its bed.

And moreover, in the harmony of *its own* powers, and their adaptation to the world, the soul finds *living* testimony against the explanation of this narrow philosophy. The simple Indian, tried as he is, by every variety of hardship, points to One Great Spirit, who is in all, and over all, and above all, the single, supreme God.

Once more :—a dogmatic Theology would inform us why man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward. It derives all human sin and grief from one human heart ; which fell by a single offence. Through all ages and countries this original fountain of bitterness has flowed on, and each suffering of humanity is but one of its rills.

But, though the soul, blinded by ignorance, and by the acute sense of its actual guilt, may bow to such a dogma, its purged sight will soon discern the falsity. It will lift its Faith to a God of benevolence and justice, who could not suffer such a fountain-head of grief to overflow the innocent and reach unborn millions in its endless course. So that, neither can the explanation given by a dogmatic Theology be received.

In respect to these explanations, it may be observed that there is one assumption from which they all proceed, and which, so far links them in one family; namely—that human sorrow is a real, ultimate *evil*. And as they make the same assumption, it might be supposed they would end in the same failure. And so it is,—they all refer this real ultimate evil back to the Supreme Cause. Atheism, though denying the being of a God, cannot get rid of the idea of something infinite, and bodies forth the confusion of its thought in the dark image of an omnipotent Destiny, as responsible for all good and all evil.

The narrow Philosophy, refusing to acknowledge that the same God can produce *both* good *and* evil,—be the fountain of “sweet waters and bitter,”—supposes with Him a malevolent being, co-eval in time, and co-equal in power. And, lastly, the dogmatic Theology makes God’s own providence the cause of evil to all but a single soul. Thus these explanations all cast dishonour upon God. The first by denying His existence—the second by denying his undivided sovereignty—and the last by denying His spotless justice. Is there then no hope? Must we sit and wring our hands in a grief, of whose origin and design we are in utter ignorance? Must weeping and wailing go on unaccounted for to the end of time? Oh, no! If atheism revolt us, and philosophy give us no help,—and a technical Theology shock our moral feelings, let us listen to the voice of Christianity,—saying that God of his own holy and benevolent will, chastens us “for our profit, that we may be partakers of His Holiness.”

The long mystery is solved, the delusions of men scattered, the heavy clouds that have shaded the earth are broken, as by a peal of thunder; God himself speaks to us and declares that He regards us as children, that he scourgeth every son whom he receiveth, that he chastens us for our profit, that we may be partakers of His Holiness.

Here then, we come to the satisfying truth. The pain of the body, or the sorrow of the heart, in fact, is not a real, ultimate evil; it is the instrument of good. Its design is to

purify the soul. It is a Father's discipline, and it has always been so. God has always loved his children. Pain has never been the sign of vengeance. But was not Adam expelled from Paradise, and condemned to obtain his bread by the sweat of his brow; to make to an offended God severe atonement for his sin? Not for this alone or chiefly. Let us say rather in order that his soul might develop its moral power. In Paradise he did not reach that character which God designed him for. In the abundance of so rich provisions for the animal nature, he submitted himself to the senses. His higher capacities were neglected. Thus it soon happened, that in opposition to conscience, and the known will of God, he ate the fruit of the forbidden tree. That is to say, his life in Paradise became sensual. It was not a life of high intellectual and moral action. And it would, no doubt, have grown, more and more, a life of voluptuous indulgence. The best gifts of God would soon have become worthless,—and a low animal pleasure the only happiness of those, in whose souls had once shown the image of the Creator. In this view, Adam's expulsion from the garden was the greatest blessing. His hard outward fortune conduced to his inward strength. Through the discipline, denial, pain, of the senses, he was freed from their dominion. By the miseries of earth he was fitted for the enjoyments of Heaven. So that, in respect to the operations of God, who is forever immutable, we may carry Christianity back to the garden of Eden, and say, even of Adam, that God chastened him for his profit, that he might be partaker of His own Holiness.

And, generally, this truth might be strikingly illustrated from the lives of individuals, and the histories of nations. And it is manifest, not only in the bodily constitution, but also, in the social nature. Is it not true, that the grief we experience at the misfortunes or death of our friends is, no more than bodily pain, an ultimate evil. But that it tends to the most precious result,—that is, the development of our spiritual nature? These social afflictions bring forth in the soul the noblest virtues. First, they teach us fortitude. And by this,

I do not mean what is often understood by this word; the power of bearing so much dead weight,—that of being able by, as by physical effort, to hold the nerve steady, while the knife or cautery is applied.

This quality would be strong, simply by being passive and unresisting. Nor would it be a nobler principle than mere animal courage. It might be produced by habitual suffering. The trait I would speak of, is a spiritual trait. It consists in the action of the spiritual nature. In the life and happiness of this action, our sorrow is drowned and lost. The lower pain is forgotten in the higher joy,—and as the soldier fights on, unmindful, in the soul's excitement, of his body's bleeding wounds, so the suffering Christian loses the acute sense of his anguish, in the experience of a far holier excitement. Fortitude is then a living principle, which makes joy well forth ever, from the bosom of sorrow. But it is also a principle of sensibility. It is not the hard power of merely enduring sorrow, and braving it out, but it has tenderness. The wound, perhaps, remains still fresh and bleeding; but the healing balm distils ever upon it, giving that sense of kind and gentle restoration, of which it is impossible, that mere hardihood, can be, in the slightest degree conscious. And when the trembling heart returns to its usual health; no acute pains, the sign of imperfect recovery, can ever be felt within the wound.

These afflictions of which I speak, teach us also to put our trust in God. They encourage the growth of that noble principle, parent of virtues—Faith. The good man cannot but *believe*, that He, who has so blessed him in time past, has intended the mournful event also for his good. Indeed he is enabled now to realize how much he has been blessed. The severity of the loss, is a *guage* that measures the value of the possession. And, therefore, even by the very depth of our groans, ought we to measure the depth of that gratitude we owe to God.

But how mighty is this principle of Faith in its positive action! With how strong, though subdued exultation does it bless the good man's soul? The spirit that has flown away

from his arms seems to have borne him with it into the Presence above. All narrow conceptions of present, private good are swept away. To his steadfast, upward gaze, the heavens seem rent. Earth fades from his eye. He has a view of the Universe, he has the vision of God. In beholding the largeness and elevation that has been given to his mind, who will not exclaim that God has afflicted him for his profit, that he might be partaker of His own Holiness. Moreover, these mortal sorrows sanctify our earthly affections. They spiritualize the bonds of mortal friendship and love. Have we considered how much of the tenderness even of the present affection comes from our mutual exposure to pain, disease, and death. Is not the rose handled the more delicately, and prized the more highly, because its hues must soon fade? And oh! is not friendship's every movement softened, and every caress made tender, because all the days of our appointed time we wait till our change come! Who has not some sympathy with the sentiment of Plotinus, who thanked God his soul was not tied to an immortal body!

Could we live on in the Paradise-state, eating and drinking, and enjoying all things pleasant to the eye, feeling no want which should not be relieved in an instant, as by a gift dropping out of the sky; never suffering bodily pain, never seeing the faces of those we love darkened by sorrow—how weak, and low, and sensual, would our life soon become! It is want, it is pain, it is sorrow, that are necessary to bring forth the energies of the intellect, and build up the virtues of the heart. What mental development could there be, when every thing should be offered in the best possible form to our hands! What depth and tenderness, what activity and strength, could there be in social affection, when the objects of this affection should feel the pressure of no necessity, should be exposed to the assault of no peril, should languish in the feebleness of no disease, and be exempt from all danger of mortal dissolution. Oh,—how cold would Friendship soon become! And, may we not ask, how soon would the lovely garden of pleasure be laid waste, by the fires of malignant

passion ! Let us thank God, then, for pain and trial, for sickness and death. Let us look upon pain, and trial, and sickness, and death, as the pledges of a nobler immortality than earth can give. It was necessary even for the Captain of our salvation in bringing many sons to glory, that he should himself be made perfect through suffering. And let us not believe that God, in the beginning meant nothing better for all his children, than the garden of Eden, nor that he means nothing better for them now, than that heaven of physical delight, of pearls and jewels and golden crowns, with which so many please their fancy.

Let us look upon all such language as but symbolizing the blessedness awaiting that spirit, which through pain and trial, shall have freed itself from the dominion of sense and mere earthly affection, and put forth in energy and joy, its own immortal powers.

In the Book of Revelation the Apostle, describing a vision of Heaven, says :—

“ And I heard a voice from Heaven as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder ; and I heard the voice of harpers, harping with their harps ; and they sang as it were a new song, before the Throne and before the four beasts and the elders ; and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty-four thousand which were redeemed from the earth.”

And why could none of the other inhabitants of Heaven learn that song. Was it to be a song of new and strange invention, altogether unconnected with the familiar melodies of the upper Temple, and therefore unknown to the elder worshippers in its Holy Courts. Long as they had sung the praises of their Creator, and in howsoever varied strains, there might doubtless fall upon their ears new songs in celebration of His glory and goodness, who is ever new in signs of strength and wonders of mercy. *But how* could there be a song which they should not have even the power of learning ? A song which the “ hundred and forty-four thousand redeemed from the earth ” would fully appreciate and unite in, but so peculiar

that those angels who served God day and night in His Temple, even before the morning stars sang together over the completed creation of this lower world, could not join their voices to the celestial harmony, but only drink in its strains of rapture?—Doubtless the reason is to be found in the peculiar experience through which this select heavenly Chior should have passed while in the flesh. Yes!—from the memory of earthly pains and sorrows must be derived those exquisite tones pouring from their lips and sounding forth from their harps. Well might it be said that none even of the Angelic Host could join in the full spirit of their song!

The scenes through which we are even now passing on the earth, may tell us something of the singular richness of this predicted melody. When from the lonely desert, or the wide waste of waters the long-absent traveller comes once more into the bosom of his family, the hymn of plaintive gladness lifted from his dwelling may give foretaste of that which the saints shall sing in glory. Yet still, how faint its sweetness compared with that of the song, whose echoes shall be heard when a Christian joins the kindred who have, from time to time, been gathered into the mansions of the great Father's House! Let us then, bear with a holy patience the pains and griefs which here afflict us. A most abundant and most fitting reward shall we gain when we join the choral company, and sing the song of those "redeemed from the earth." Let us not too sorely grieve for those now lost to the sight of these mortal eyes and the hearing of these fleshly ears,—but even become glad in the hope of seeing them clothed in their celestial bodies, and listening to voices unspoiled of any of earth's tones of sympathy and love, though strengthened into the richness of the heavenly melody. Soon will the veil drop. The mourning Rachel will gain that comfort, which earth denies, and receive the afflictions of time ripened into the harvest of eternal joy—

Oh! when a Mother meets on high
 The Babe she lost in infancy,
 Hath she not then for pains and fears,
 The day of wo, the watchful night,
 For all her sorrow, all her tears,
 An overpayment of delight?

And the Father, from whom disease or accident has snatched the hope of his age!—If himself faithful unto death, will find that the Destroyer has but raised his child to glory, and but prepared him for that one family above—that hundred and forty-four thousand redeemed from the earth—among whom all who now rightly endure the great Parent's discipline will be numbered!

C. A. B.

THOUGHTS ON THE RESURRECTION.

I THINK the Scriptures do not decide for us the interesting question of the time of the resurrection. There are many passages equally strong perhaps on both sides—leading us to believe sometimes that a general resurrection is intended, and sometimes, the individual. It is hardly possible, however, to reflect long upon the subject, without forming an opinion of our own from a comparison of these passages, and from our internal convictions of what is most reasonable and desirable.

There is something indescribably grand and terrific in the idea of a Day of Judgment—a day of final account—when the whole universe shall be assembled before the throne of God—when the millions upon millions of the dead shall at once awake into the awful presence!—and there to stand the

trial of deeds done in the body—who can describe such a scene? Who can pourtray it even to himself! The idea is too vast for human intellect—a congregation of all who have died upon the face of the earth—with all who shall be born and die until the end of time, supposing as we must that this earth is yet in its infancy—that the six thousand years already gone are but a beginning, and that millions of centuries must yet pass away before its final dissolution. Who can imagine a multitude like this? Who but would shrink from the exposure of his secret thoughts, desires, and sins before an assembly so vast—of all nations and tongues. Yet I know not that this array of human souls can add to the real majesty of the scene, when we shall behold the Father face to face, in company with the great Teacher of our faith. Why should we shrink from assembled nations and tongues, when the eye of God himself is upon us!

There are many difficulties to my mind in this scheme. Where is the soul during all this waiting for the judgment? It cannot sleep with the body, for the body has long since mingled with the dust—it has been scattered in ashes to the four winds—it has become incorporated in numberless other bodies—reduced to its original, simple elements, it has undergone transformations without end, from the vegetable to the animal, from animal again to man, so that we can hardly believe that omnipotence itself should restore its individuality. Where then does the soul rest, while these processes of nature are going on, again and again? Where is *now* the soul of Adam, the first who was created, and where shall it continue through these countless ages which will pass before the end of the world?

These may be idle speculations; it may seem immaterial when we shall awake, if we awake unconscious that we have slept; if there appears no lapse between the hour of parting with our earthly friends, and meeting them in that great and terrible day—though generation after generation may in the meantime have been swept away and forgotten.

But this seems to me unlike all the other arrangements of Providence, in its *waste*, if we may call it so, of time. Throughout the whole universe, so far as we can trace it, there is no waste—no cessation—all is going on, and hastening forward. There is not a moment in which some great process is not in operation. There is not an atom so minute, or so insignificant, but performs an important part in the vast whole—and must the soul, that “ever living” principle, as we have proudly called it, remain so long inactive? Must it make no progress? Must it lie buried, we know not where, or how, or for how long? Why—we are tempted to ask—might not these ages of lethargy be rather spent, in perfecting its marvellous powers—in disencumbering itself of all remaining impurity—in tasting those glorious rewards prepared for all who love the Father and keep his commandments. True, eternity is before us, and these ages of sleep may be only as a single day compared with the endless circle of years beyond. But who that has experienced human life alone, can *feel* it to be so.

Oh let us rather have the privilege of believing that the hour of mortal death is the hour of spiritual birth. Let us repeat at the death-bed, the promise of the Saviour—“*To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise!*” Let us realize that God who is constantly around and within us, will not desert us in that trying hour, that as he has witnessed each successive thought and action of our lives, he will at once pronounce our judgment and our doom, when he calls us from the scene of our labours. There we shall be—possibly sympathising with, and watching over those whom we have left—ready certainly to welcome them, when they shall follow us.

H. H.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE WORKS OF JOSEPH STEVENS BUCKMINSTER ; WITH
MEMOIRS OF HIS LIFE. Boston : James Munroe & Co.
2 vols. 12mo.

ONE of the first religious books we remember to have read, was the first volume of Buckminster's Sermons ; and the beautifully written life and two or three of the discourses fixed themselves in the mind, as nothing is fixed there save in our early years.

Buckminster seems almost to have realized our highest ideas of what a clergyman should be in a New-England city. He was not a distorted man, remarkable only for some single trait. He was not merely a good man, nor a learned man, nor an able reasoner, nor a brilliant writer, nor an efficient preacher, nor a useful pastor, but he was each and all. In the words of an old English dramatist, which we may be permitted to quote as describing him,—

" Every virtue
Which, parted unto others, gave them name,
Flowed mixed in him."

Notwithstanding his youth,—he died at 28,—he was one of the most accomplished general scholars of the land. His attainments were especially great in the study of his choice, theology ; and when in 1811 he was appointed the first Dexter Professor of Biblical Criticism, his biographer says, that the appointment was universally thought to be an honour most justly due to his pre-eminent attainments in this science. He was one of those most active in all the philanthropic objects of the day. He was remarkable for the charm of his private manners. His sermons, as sermons, are certainly surpassed

by none in the language. He was not distinguished in one thing, but in all the faculties of the mind, and in all the best qualities of the character. And to all, he added the charm of a life, which seemed to have been consecrated by Providence, from the beginning, to the ministerial office. His life from infancy till death was marked by the same purity and consistency. There were no blots or breaks for the scoffer to point at; none of those youthful failings or perversities, which though ever so truly repented of, are so apt to be remembered and to diminish the power of a minister's appeals to others. His sister had no recollection, when they were children, "that he ever did anything that was wrong." Those virtues which others attain to, through a series of repentances and struggles, appeared in him so easy, so natural, so unforced, that one might almost think that the effort and self-denial would have been to abstain from what was right. The innocence of the child expanded by steady growth into the christian principles of the man. And when he stood in the pulpit it was not the eloquent tongue and beaming eye alone that spoke, but a life of innocence and purity and faith. Evil thoughts, bad passions, unworthy habits, could feign to themselves no apology by referring to the same things in his preceding life, but stood rebuked and dumb, as if in the pure presence of a messenger from God.

His sermons have the same completeness as his character. Generally, the most eminent preachers have been remarkable but for some single thing. If we think of Jeremy Taylor, we are likely first of all and chiefly, to remember the sacred poetry which like sunset light shines through the masses of his thoughts. Butler and Sherlock were reasoners. Blair was the embodiment of propriety. He always remembered that he was a Lecturer on Rhetoric, and he is always as smooth and commonplace and tame and sensible and unexceptionable as every one must be, who writes by set rule and with the constant dread of criticism before his eyes. Most Sermons have been really addressed to but some single class. Butler's Sermons would have no hold on any save men of logical and

speculative minds. We do not wonder that Barrow put to sleep all but the few who wished to hear every sensible thing that could possibly be said on a subject, in detail. In Buckminster's Sermons there is a remarkable union of different qualities. Many of our readers may have first read them in early youth, and even then have felt that there was a power in them to control both mind and heart; and when they were first delivered, the attention of the ablest minds of the day were held spell-bound by them. They have been alike popular with the uneducated and the cultivated. Nor were they merely addressed to the intellect. They are religious sermons. Argument, illustration, imagination, a felicitous style, strong emotion,—all blend together as they ought, to arouse the conscience and to quicken the religious sensibilities. It were an easy and pleasant task to speak at length of these discourses; but it would be an unprofitable one. They do not need criticism to unfold their excellencies. We will only add, that we rejoice to see this new edition, and would commend it to all who do not already possess the writings of Buckminster.

P.

McDONNER: OR, TRUTH THROUGH FICTION. *By Jacob Abbott.*

THIS is a continuation, and we presume a conclusion, of the book which Mr. Abbott published a year ago, called, "Hoary-head, and the Valleys below." And we think it not so interesting or useful a book as the first. They are independent works, but the same characters are introduced. The common object is to set forth by the aid of fiction and a free use of the imagination, "the principles of moral truth, and the spiritual wants of the human soul in seeking deliverance from sin." And this is done in a way that must engage every reader. Whatever his views of truth, and the kind of truth here presented, he cannot fail of being interested and carried along with pleasure through these volumes. Of the first,

HOARYHEAD, the interest is peculiar; and with the exception of a few pages at the end of a decidedly calvinistic and false character, it is one of the most pleasant and instructive books of the kind known to us. Nor does that exception, bad as it is, seem to us enough to condemn the book. We might hesitate to put into the hands of the very young, the unreflecting, and unsettled in faith. But even with them, we should have more hope of good than fear of evil. We are not willing to throw away and excommunicate every book that contains a single page or a single line of erroneous doctrine. We have too much confidence in truth, and in the discernment and independence of common minds to whom the truth is familiar. We have no more fear of their reading a little false doctrine, than of their hearing it preached occasionally. It is saying little for ourselves or our faith, if we cannot venture, or allow a friend to venture, upon conversation and even controversy with an opponent; why then fear to encounter a little volume, which, with a great preponderance of truth and good, and a christian temper throughout, utters a few words of error or absurdity?

With this view of such matters, we can recommend McDONNER also. It is, as we have said, a less interesting book than its predecessor, but it has interest and may be read with profit. It deals more with religious questions, particularly the vexed and interminable dispute about free agency and the power of the will. It is therefore more theological, and of course more sectarian than the other. With some of its speculations and assertions, we have little sympathy. Still they are not made offensive, nor are they often obtruded. Much of the book is free from everything of the kind. Much of it in fact has less of moral and instruction, than we desire. There is too much of common and boyish description, too much minuteness of detail about trifles. Mr. Abbott's characteristic defects, amplification and diffuseness, are here very obvious and sometimes tedious. But as a whole, we like the book. It awakens earnest thoughts, and stirs questions, and leads to serious self-inquests, such as seldom fail to be useful. That a

man does not like a book entirely or cannot assent to all its positions, is of little consequence, compared with its power of compelling him to think, to explore, to repent, to resolve on better things, and go to God for strength. H.

THE MORAL TEACHER: DESIGNED AS A CLASS BOOK FOR
COMMON SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.
By a Clergyman. New York: Robinson and Franklin.
1839.

AN excellent little book; well calculated to remedy a large part of the deficiency in common school education of which we took occasion to speak in our second number. We are glad to see this practical illustration of the feasibility of some of the views we there expressed. The book is a brief but pretty complete system of social morals, placed, we think, on the right foundation, expressed in such language, and illustrated by such familiar incidents in domestic and school life as to make it intelligible to children from eight to twelve years of age for whom it is designed. It is throughout an appeal to the native moral sense,—a sense liable to perversion and susceptible of cultivation, but the germ of which is in every soul and cannot be rooted out. Though the author does not use revelation as an authority, but determines duty on strictly ethical principles, the morality he inculcates is that of the Gospel. The second book, and especially the section on the "Duties of American Citizens," contains principles which should be engrained in the soul of every American child. It would be well if many children of a larger growth were more fully indoctrinated in them. Our only feeling of regret in reading the book was occasioned by the brevity in the treatment of particular topics, which was unavoidable in discussing so extensive a subject within such narrow limits. Sound and valuable principles and rules of conduct proceed in such rapid succession that we fear many of them will be overlooked in

the crowd. We were so often reminded of the excellent manner of Abbott that we could not but feel the more sensibly the want of his amplitude of illustration, though we are aware it would have been inconsistent with the design of the book. It should be regarded as a book not to be read merely but studied. Its sections and paragraphs must be dwelt upon. Parents and teachers must take pains to raise the various questions which suggest themselves under the topics discussed. We hope that this little work will prove a timely supply of a felt want, and that it will soon obtain a general admittance into our district schools. Surely the public mind cannot much longer remain satisfied with the very defective scheme of education which neglects the cultivation of the moral and spiritual powers.

SELECTION.

NEVER do any thing through strife, or envy, or emulation, or vain glory. Never do any thing in order to excel other people ; but in order to please God, and because it is his will that you should do every thing in the best manner. For, if it were a pleasure to you to excel other people, it will by degrees be a pleasure to you to see other people not so good as yourself.

Banish therefore every thought of pride and self-distinction ; and accustom yourself to rejoice in the excellencies and perfections of your fellow creatures, and be as glad to see any of their good actions as your own.

For, as God is as well pleased with their good doings as with yours, so you ought to desire that every thing wise, and holy, and good may be performed in as high a manner by other people as by yourself.—*Law.*

INTELLIGENCE.

LIVERPOOL UNITARIAN CONTROVERSY.—Since the publication of our last number, further accounts have been received of the progress of the controversy in Liverpool between our Unitarian brethren and the ministers of the Church establishment. Several letters passed between the parties to the controversy. The Church ministers, through their organ, the Rev. Mr. Ould, accepted the invitation to carry on a discussion separate from the course of lectures, and proposed that it should be a platform discussion, to be conducted in speeches of one hour or half an hour each. This proposal is rejected altogether by Messrs. Martineau, Giles, and Thom, the Unitarian ministers, because they do not think a miscellaneous audience "the best tribunal to which to submit abstruse theological questions respecting the canon, the text, the translation of Scripture." They then renew their original proposal of a discussion through the press, to be so conducted as to bring the arguments on both sides before the attention of the same parties.

The Rev. Mr. Ould replies by a long letter, in which he attributes their declining an oral controversy to a "secret consciousness of the weakness of their cause;" and says, in answer to one of their objections to such a course—the difficulty of answering off-hand all possible arguments—that this is no more difficult for the Unitarian than for the Trinitarian.

The Rev. Messrs. Martineau, Giles, and Thom, in answer to the above, say, "We apprehend, Rev. Sir, that nobody but yourself would think of attributing to conscious weakness our preference of the most perfect and searching method of discussion to the most flimsy, insufficient, and unscholarlike that could by possibility be selected. Had we wished to catch the ear of a popular assembly, or to turn away attention from weak points by oratorical artifices, we should have proposed this platform controversy, instead of, as we did, carefully and purposely wording our invitation and our enumeration of the modes in which the controversy might be conducted, so as to exclude the idea of oral discussion. We observe with sorrow, and with diminished hope of benefit from the controversy, that you can so sink the interests of truth in personal championship, as to meet our solemn unwillingness to intrust the gravest questions to extempore dexterity and accidental recollection, with the reply that in this respect we should be at least

equally situated. Doubtless, sir, if a display of personal prowess was our object, this would be conclusive; but *TRUTH* is our object, and we dare not offer it such worthless advocacy."

Three of the church ministers, Rev. Messrs. Byrth, Ould, and M'Neile, on their own responsibility, accept the proposal of carrying on a discussion, "in the form of a correspondence in some public journal or periodical, altogether independent of the lectures." The subjects proposed for discussion are, the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and the doctrines of the Church Theology. The church ministers propound certain questions to the Unitarians, that they may know precisely what the controversy is to be about, whether a discussion upon evidence or upon interpretation. Some other letters passed between the parties, which we have not yet seen. We give "the conclusion of the whole matter," from a postscript in the London "Christian Reformer," from which we have gathered the above information.

"Since we closed the report of this controversy, we have received two important letters, one by the Trinitarian Clergy, the other by the Unitarian Ministers. The Trinitarians announce that they shall *quit the field*, having found out that their antagonists are not fight-worthy; the Unitarians prove upon the run-aways, cowardice and hypocrisy. Never did tournament, challenged with such a flourish of trumpets, end with more disgrace to the challenging knights-errant."

THE MINISTRY AT LARGE IN BOSTON.—Our readers will be pleased to see the following distinct account of this ministry, which we copy from the fifth Annual Report of the "Benevolent Fraternity of Churches."

The first movements of the Ministry to the poor in this city may be traced as far back as the year 1822, when, under the patronage of an association of gentlemen for religious improvement, several laymen undertook to give evening lectures for their instruction in Hatters Square and other places. Their labours were useful, as a testimony to the poor of an awakening interest in their welfare, and as a means of obtaining more accurate information respecting their character and wants. They were continued at intervals through several successive years.

The permanent character, however, which the Ministry has since assumed is, undoubtedly, chiefly due to the Rev. Dr. Tuckerman, who, on leaving his parish in Chelsea, determined to devote himself to this work. He was appointed in 1826 to the mission, which he has since so ably sustained, by the American Unitarian Association, and on the 5th of November in that year entered upon the duties of his office.

An upper room in a building in Merrimac Street was hired for his use, where he held a regular service each Sunday evening. A Sunday School for poor children was also soon gathered in the same place, through the efforts of a few of the teachers of the Hancock Sunday

School, who left that flourishing institution to engage in this unpromising undertaking. In addition to his labours in the lecture room, Dr. Tuckerman commenced a system of visiting from house to house among the poorer classes; and in the course of the first year had formed a personal acquaintance, more or less intimate, with 170 families. The success of these various efforts was at first so small as to have discouraged all but the most ardent minds. But a beginning in a good cause had been made. Much valuable information respecting the actual condition and characters of the less favoured classes had been gained, and was communicated to the public in quarterly reports addressed to the Association. The consequence was that the interest in the subject, which had hitherto been confined to a few individuals, was now spread more widely through the community. In 1828, a small wooden chapel was erected by subscription in Friend Street; and on removal to it a larger congregation and school were soon collected. In 1833, Dr. Tuckerman was assisted in his labours by Messrs. Barnard and Gray. In 1834, the American Unitarian Association, conceiving that the time had arrived when it was expedient to place the Ministry at Large upon a more permanent footing, transferred its interests in it to the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches, which was instituted for the purpose, and in whose charge it has since remained.

In 1835, a spacious building was erected in Warren Street, which Mr. Barnard occupied, under the auspices of this Fraternity, but becoming particularly interested in the condition of children, and intending to devote his attention chiefly to them, he dissolved his connection with us. During the succeeding year, a neat and equally commodious chapel was erected in Pitts Street, for Mr. Gray, who had taken the place of Dr. Tuckerman, whose ill health disabled him from continuing his usual labours. The religious services and Sunday School in Friend Street were removed to the new building and a new and most remarkable impulse was given to the cause by the change. The church and school room were almost immediately filled up, and have so continued to the present time, when solicitude is occasioned, not by the smallness of the numbers that attend, but by the inadequacy of the building to accommodate all those who desire to resort to it. New services were instituted, and a wider sphere of usefulness was opened. In 1837, Messrs. Waterston and Sargent were elected Ministers at Large. The field of Mr Waterston's labours is in the Northern section of the city, and, not having yet completed his preparatory studies, he at present devotes but a part of his time to the work. To Mr. Sargent is assigned the extreme Southern section of the city, where there is a large and rapidly increasing population of the less fortunate classes, to which he gives his undivided attention. During the past year a project has been entertained for building a Chapel in this section; and we are most happy to state that, notwithstanding many serious impediments which lie in its way, it is likely to be accomplished the present season.

The Pitts Street Chapel is crowded to overflowing; even the aisles are not unfrequently entirely filled up. The audience, from Sunday to Sunday, consist mostly of the same individuals; and they are very constant in their attendance, and, to all appearance, deeply interested. There are at present 221 families, consisting of 493 adults and 321 children, in connection with the Pitts Street Church, and about 70 families, including 123 adults and 130 children, in regular attendance at the Southern Chapel. There are 131 communicants in the Pitts

Street Church, and 23 in the Southern Chapel. They hold frequent meetings, which have proved to be highly useful in producing kind feelings, eliciting interchange of thought and sentiment, and encouraging conversation upon religious topics. There are in the Pitts Street Sunday School 50 teachers and 420 pupils, with an average attendance of from 275 to 300; at the Southern station there are 20 teachers and 130 pupils.

Another appendage to the Chapel is the sewing circle. It embraces from 200 to 400 girls, who meet each Wednesday and Saturday afternoon to learn this useful art. Some of them belong to the Sunday School, and others do not; and the same is the case with their teachers. During the school, singing or reading by one of the ladies is always going on. The only other accompaniment to the Chapel which we shall notice, is a Society of Young Men for Mutual Improvement. It consists chiefly of apprentices, clerks, and young persons who attend worship in Pitts Street. They meet once a fortnight to hear a lecture, or discuss some moral subject. They intend also to establish a reading room, containing books and papers, to which they may resort daily. A similar Association has been formed by Mr. Sargent at the Southern Chapel, where lectures and discussions have been frequently held the past winter.

The Board have determined to commence a series of Tracts, adapted to the comprehension and moral condition of persons within the sphere of our Ministers' labours. They are to be published every other month, and we trust they will prove highly useful to those for whom they are intended. During the past year a communication was received from the Treasurer of the Domestic Mission Society in London, accompanied by two reports and several volumes of tracts. The Society expresses a very lively interest in the operations of this Fraternity. It has two Chapels, under the care of efficient clergymen, and its plans of operation are almost identical with our own. Similar Institutions exist in Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester, and are believed to be in a good degree successful.

BEQUEST FOR THE PURPOSES OF UNITARIAN WORSHIP IN THE CITY OF PERTH.—David Taylor, builder in Perth, died in August, 1832, leaving a will by which he gave and bequeathed to the General Unitarian Baptist Assembly, meeting yearly on Whit-Tuesday in London, the sum of One Thousand Pounds sterling, with instructions that the interest of that sum should be applied to the maintenance of a preacher of their connexion in the City of Perth, and directing that every year, on the Sabbath immediately following the 27th of November, there be a discourse delivered in Perth on the Unity of the Divine Nature in the Person of the Father only. Payment of this legacy being on various pretexts withheld by William Taylor, lime-merchant in Perth, the brother and executor of the deceased, the Assembly at their last annual meeting authorised a special committee of their members to institute an action for its recovery before the Court of Session, nominating Robert Neil, of Edinburgh, S. S. C., their mandatory in the suit. Against this action defences were lodged on the part of Taylor, in which he pled preliminarily, *inter alia*, that the action was not maintainable, inasmuch as the object of the legacy was the propagation of tenets which are not only not recognized by the State, but are condemned by the law of the country, as directly and inveterately hostile to the creed which forms part and parcel of the law of the land.

The case came to depend before Lord Jeffrey, who repelled the preliminary defences generally, and in particular the defence above quoted, "in respect that the purpose for which the legacy is left is not a criminal or illegal purpose, or one which can, in any sound sense, be regarded as dangerous to good morals, or offensive to decency or good order." In a note appended to the interlocutor, his Lordship remarks, "Where there is nothing in the tenets of a religious sect which is contrary to express law, to good morals, or to public decency, the Lord Ordinary can see no ground upon which any distinction can be taken, in a civil court, between one tolerated sect and another. There can be no doubt that, by the existing law, the sect of Unitarians is entitled to the fullest measure of toleration; and it would be absurd to hold that there was anything to corrupt virtue or outrage decency in tenets which have been advocated, in our own days, by men of such eminent talents, exemplary piety, and pure lives, as Price, Priestley, and Channing, and to which there is reason think that neither Milton nor Newton were disinclined. Those who belong to the great Establishment of the Church of England, it should also be considered, are but *sectaries* in Scotland, and depend for their protection on the same toleration which has now been extended to Unitarians. It would probably startle even the defender, however, if it were made a question whether a legacy could be recovered, or a loan reclaimed, for the purpose of building or repairing an Episcopal chapel, or paying the salary of an officiating clergyman."

MR. DEWEY'S DISCOURSES.—From a notice of these Discourses in the London Christian Reformer, we extract the following passages:—

This is a very extraordinary book, abounding in generous sentiments and fine and brilliant writing, and containing much valuable moral instruction; but not without passages that will startle many readers and offend some. The title-page is strangely deficient in not stating that the volume consists of "Sabbath-evening" sermons delivered at New York, in the United States of America, by the author, who is pastor of one of the Unitarian churches of that city. In no other city than New York, and in no other Country than the United States, could such discourses have been delivered with the semblance of propriety.

It is certainly new to read in sermons, of bullion, paper-currency, the monetary system and packet ships in the offing,—but the objection will vanish if the Discourses be considered as moral lectures. The public know that Mr. Dewey can write sermons, properly so called, and sermons that are heard with deep interest, and read to moral and spiritual profit. After all, if he and his congregation agree upon the utility and acceptableness of the discussion of topics of commerce, economy, and politics, in their own pulpit, no one has a right to censure or complain. The only business of the critic is to inquire whether what was proposed, be well done.

We admire the moral courage of the preacher, who lays bare before his countrymen those national faults and blemishes concerning which, when handled by foreigners, they are morbidly sensitive; and points immoral practices which are to be found in every seat of commerce, and are alleged to be of discreditable frequency in the American emporium of trade.

DR. CHANNING'S SELF-CULTURE is noticed in the *Christian Reformer* in these terms:—

Our readers will welcome another contribution to sound morals and rational piety from Dr. Channing. "Self-Culture" is in his usual manner,—fervid, powerful, spiritual. Nothing could be less *Franklinian* in substance or style; but the lecture is pregnant with thoughts which Franklin himself would have heard with admiration. Mechanics' Institutes, and such auditories as Dr. Channing addressed on this occasion, require to be instructed and to be impressed with the conviction, that there is something in the universe besides matter and motion.

SIR ISAAC NEWTON'S MANUSCRIPTS.—We are enabled (says the *Unitarian Baptist Advocate*, for February,) to state to our readers the interesting intelligence, which has reached us from a source on whose authority we can fully rely, that a recent examination of the large collection of Sir Isaac Newton's MSS. has removed all doubt with regard to his religious views. It has been said (see *Unit. Bapt. Advocate*, Vol. II. p. 59) that Sir Isaac Newton "left behind him a cart-load of papers on religious subjects, which Dr. Horsley examined and declared unfit for publication." The reason of this is now obvious, since these MSS. are conclusive, we learn, as to the author's total rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity. Among those which relate to early Church History, are some severe strictures on the character of Athanasius, which may be thought to impart some probability to the supposition mentioned by Whiston in his *Authentic Records* (see *Unit. Bapt. Advocate*, Vol. II. p. 103,) that he was the author of "The Acts of Great Athanasius," in the old quarto Unitarian Tracts.

PRIESTLEY ANNIVERSARY.—March 13, being Dr. Priestley's birth-day, was celebrated by a dinner at Birmingham, Mr. Thomas Billingham, President, and Mr. Sandon, Vice-President. On the "Immortal Memory" of the Philosopher, Patriot, Philanthropist, and Divine, being proposed, the Chairman delivered a glowing eulogium upon his character, stating truly that, "whether from the press or the pulpit, in public or private, on philosophy or politics, the objects he ever kept permanently in view were, the glory of God and the happiness of the human race." The toast was drunk by the company standing and (so the newspaper report) "uncovered." In Birmingham, there has been some progress since 1791.

STRAUSS IN SWITZERLAND.—This German divine, whose Life of Jesus has made him so notorious, was appointed last year to be Professor of Theology at Zurich. This is said to have been in part a political movement, effected by the radical party and in opposition to the influence of the clergy. "This was setting up," says a letter from Zurich, "not the standard of liberalism, but that of infidelity; and the

people became every where indignant and excited." They met in their parishes every where to protest against the appointment, and passed a remonstrance by a vote of 38,690 to 978. In consequence of this the Grand Council came to the decision that Strauss should retire from his office. The radicals wished to compromise the matter, by allowing him to lecture in one chair while some orthodox professor should lecture in another. But the Zurich peasantry threatened to stone Strauss, and so for peace' sake he was removed.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.—It appears from the last Annual Report, that during the last year 25 new auxiliaries have been formed; one of them in Wisconsin Territory, one in that of Iowa, and one in Texas. The receipts of the year from all sources amount to \$95,127, which is nearly \$10,000 more than those of the year previous, but less by about one third than the demands of the Institution. Applications to the amount of \$35,000 are now before the Board at the end of the year, and new calls must soon be presented. The number of Books issued is 134,937, making an aggregate since the formation of the Society of \$2,486,235. Owing to the great number of foreign residents, Bibles are often called for which the Society does not yet publish. Such are consequently ordered from abroad. They have been imported the past year in Italian, Dutch, Portugese, Danish, Welsh, Swedish, Arabic, and Syriae. As the early numbers of the Society's Reports are exhausted, and are frequently called for, the Board have reprinted the entire series down to the present year. They are comprised in one large octavo volume, with a list of all life members from the beginning. The volume will be sold simply at the cost price.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN PHILADELPHIA.—It appears by the twenty-first Annual Report of the Controllors of the city and county of Philadelphia—recently submitted—that during the past year, upwards of eighteen thousand pupils have been enjoying the advantages of regular instruction there throughout the whole year. Referring to this Report the National Gazette says, "In England, legislators are just beginning to talk of national education. The fund *proposed* to be applied to the purpose in all England does not, by one fourth, equal the sum actually expended in this country."

MISSIONS OF THE UNITED BRETHREN.—At the close of 1837, the missions of the United Brethren embraced 46 stations, 230 Missionaries, including five assistants, and 450,637 converts; of whom about 15,400 were communicants. Of these, 2758 were Greenlanders and Esquimaux; 360 Indians, 43,942 Negroes, and 3,577 Hottentots and other natives of South Africa.

It is interesting to compare the present condition of the Missions of the United Brethren with the past. "When the Moravians or United Brethren first undertook to send out the word of salvation to the benighted heathen, their own congregation did not exceed *six hundred* persons; and of these the greater part were exiles from their native land, who, after enduring the most cruel persecutions on account of their religion, found a tranquil and hospitable asylum on the estate of Count Zinzendorf, at Berthelsdorf, in Upper Lusatia." A few young men offered to go as Missionaries to Greenland. They were joined by several others in the course of a few years, and these men, in the midst of dreadful suffering and with almost no success to cheer their hearts, laboured on undismayed. Now there are 2700 Greenlanders and Esquimaux converts to Christianity.

The origin of the Missions of the Moravians to the West Indies is interesting. A negro at Copenhagen gave the first idea of sending Missionaries to those Islands. He stated that he had a sister in the island of St. Thomas, who with many of her companions, desired to be instructed in the way of salvation; but, he added, that no persons could have access to the slaves, who were not united with them in their daily avocations. Two young men at once declared their willingness to go, and sell themselves as slaves, if such a step should be necessary. A mission begun in such a spirit could not fail.

The Moravians now have stations in Greenland, Labrador, among the Indians of North America, in eight of the West India Islands, in South America, and in Africa.

ANOTHER CHAPEL FOR THE POOR.—The corner stone of the Suffolk Street Chapel, at the extreme southern section of Boston, was laid, with interesting ceremonies, on the 23d of May, ult. Address from the Rev. J. T. Sargent, for whose ministry the Chapel is building.

INSTALLATION.—The installation of Rev. J. P. B. Storer, (late of Walpole in this State,) took place at Syracuse, N. Y. on the 20th of June ult. Sermon by Rev. Orville Dewey. A report of the services on this interesting occasion, will be given in our next.